India

FOR THE

No. 200. New Series. No. 294. Old Series. WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1901. [Registered as a Newspaper. Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 205
Lord George Hamilton *versus* John Stuart Mill... 208
Our London Letter 209
Notes from Bombay 210
Chronicle of the Week 210
Letters to the Editor:
Drought-Resisting Fodder Plants 211
Mr. Dutt on Land Revenue Assessments 212
Memorial to Sir W. W. Hunter:
Speech of the Marquis of Dufferin 212
The Famine in India:
Grave Anticipations 212
The *Investors' Review* Fund 212
Indian Agriculture: Lecture by Mr. Romesh C. Dutt, C.I.E.... 213
Lord George Hamilton on the Drain from India... 215
Advertisements 216

NOTES AND NEWS.

WITHIN the limits of British India, Indians are held to be incapable of performing high executive functions—at least they are never appointed to the highest posts, and seldom to any involving much responsibility. It is a commonplace with Anglo-Indian writers that, however excellent they may be as Judges, they are wanting in the energy, determination, and power of command needed in an administrator. It is all the more surprising, therefore, to find that in the Native States these same Indians are often most successful administrators by universal admission. We lately called attention to the praises lavished on the late Dewan of Mysore. Now it is the turn of the Dewan of Baroda, who is retiring after five years of office. Mr. Srinivasa Raghava Iyengar now retires amid general goodwill. The "Times of India" says: "Under his impartial government the voice of faction has been hushed, and it is no exaggeration to say that, among the varied and not always concordant elements of the Baroda community," he "leaves behind him none but the kindliest feelings of respect for his ability and amiability of disposition."

This is high praise from an Anglo-Indian organ. Nor is it lessened when we remember the circumstances of his term of office. Though he went to Baroda with a good reputation he was a total stranger there. Moreover, the position of Dewan of Baroda is rendered more difficult owing to the possession of certain rights by some of the Gaekwar's subjects, guaranteed by the British Government. Above all, Mr. Srinivasa Raghava Iyengar's term of office synchronised with a long period of distress culminating in a terrible famine. Yet the "Times of India" is able to say that he closes his "Baroda career with reputation undimmed and character enhanced for its integrity and devotion to duty." The time he spent as Dewan was one to test a man's capacity. According to our contemporary: 'The success of his plague administration has been recognised by the paramount power." But why should not Indians be equally successful in British territory?

A friendly correspondent has written to Lord George Hamilton, putting to him the naïve question whether the "drain" of 30 or 40 millions a year from India to England without any "adequate return"—why not "economic return"?—"did not, to a very great extent, consist of interest on money invested mainly by the British in railways and other beneficial enterprises in India, which had proved of incalculable benefit in times of famine." Lord George Hamilton replied:—

> The view of the position as indicated in the questions which you have put is substantially correct. The large annual expenditure on railways and other public works tends naturally to the development of the country and to the amelioration of the condition of the Native population. Famine, as you say, is attributable to climatic conditions.

The questioner must be refreshingly verdant if he is satisfied with such a superficial and jesuitic answer. Admitting, for the sake of argument, the extreme claim of beneficent works of all kinds, the deeper question yet remains: Can the country afford the expenditure? The answer to that is, only too plainly, that it cannot. The attribution of famine to climatic conditions is such a perverse half-truth that one gets tired of ridiculing it. And even if it were the whole truth, is that the last word of the India Office on the subject? We discuss the whole matter in some detail elsewhere.

In this connexion we may revert to a passage in the last "debate on the Indian Budget" (August 16, 1901). Lord George Hamilton, in the course of his speech, referred to "a small school in this country as well as in India who are perpetually asserting" that British rule is bleeding India. He added (and we quote from the corrected report in the authorised "Parliamentary Debates"):—

> This belief is founded not on figures, or facts, or economic data, but on a plausible syllogistic formula that they are never tired of repeating. India, they assert, is a very poor country; its poverty is annually increased by that yearly drain caused by an excess of exports over imports. This drain is enforced upon India by the necessity of yearly meeting the obligations of the Government in gold in this country, and as this Government by continual borrowing increases these obligations so it quickens the process of impoverishment. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman the member for Camborne holds those views.
>
> Mr. Caine: Not at all.
>
> Lord G. Hamilton: But I think he will admit that I have not unfairly stated the allegation that is constantly made.
>
> Mr. Caine: It is hardly worth answering.

A somewhat significant passage, we think.

The "Times of India" entitles one of its notes, "A Departure in the Congress Programme." It is interesting as an example of Indian unity that this information as to the proceedings of a Congress to be held in Calcutta is obtained by this Anglo-Indian Bombay journal from a vernacular paper, the "Swadessamitran," published in the Madras Presidency. But it is to be feared that this "departure," of which our Bombay contemporary so highly approves, is only a continuation and reiteration of the programme of former Congresses. It is, in fact, becoming quite usual for Anglo-Indian papers, after vilifying the Congress for years, to praise it for some fancied new development, which really consists only in following out the old lines. Thus among the items which constitute the new departure are the effect of the land-revenue assessment and the need of a Government enquiry into the subject, the condition of Indian industries, the institution of technical education, and the importance of Indians doing what they can in that matter even without the help of the Government. But, surely, as all those who have followed the proceedings of the Indian National Congress know, these subjects have already appeared on the Agenda, year after year.

It is time that the stale fallacy that the Indian National Congress and the Indian Press have neglected technical education should be abandoned. For the Congress the records of its past action sufficiently speak; while the files of the Indian papers show that the charge is not deserved by them. Notably is this the case with the "Tribune," which has for a long time devoted a great amount of attention to the subject. In the number of October 3 there is a long and important article on "Technical Education in Japan and in India," in which the flourishing condition of the former country in comparison with the latter is attributed in great measure to the efforts of the Japanese Government to provide ample facilities for technical education. Especially is the "Tribune" anxious that an improved agriculture should be taught in India. The decaying industries may possibly be incapable of revival, even with the best teaching, but as they have decayed, greater and ever greater numbers have sought in agriculture for a means of subsistence, so that the need of improved methods of cultivation has become more and more urgent. On the other hand, we must remember the cautions given by Mr. Dutt in the lecture reported on another

page. Let us be sure that the improvements are really improvements—in the special circumstances of the case.

On Saturday last (October 26) two memorials to the late Sir William Hunter were unveiled. One was a memorial window, of stained glass, in the parish church of Cumnor, near Oxford, bearing the following inscription:—

To the glory of God, and in loving memory of Sir William Wilson Hunter, K.C.S.I., who died 7th February, 1900. Erected by his many friends at home and in India.

The Vicar, in accepting the gift, said that Sir William "had endeared himself to the heart of every member of the parish of every age and every degree." The second memorial was a bronze bust of Sir William by Mr. Hamo Thornycroft, R.A., at the Indian Institute, Oxford. The front of the pedestal bears the inscription:—

Sir William Wilson Hunter, K.C.S.I.,
1840—1890.
Curator of the Indian Institute,
1893—1900.

The Marquis of Dufferin, on unveiling the bust, eulogised Sir William Hunter, stating that, on all the many occasions on which he had consulted him officially, he "never failed to exhibit the greatest zeal and the most anxious industry in order to come to the assistance of the Government of India." He made feeling reference to Lady Hunter, remarking that it would be "a consolation to her to know how deeply Sir William Hunter's qualities, both intellectual and individual, had been appreciated by so large a circle of friends." The Vice-Chancellor justly said that "Sir William Hunter did exactly the sort of work that in these days we most want, the pursuit of knowledge which is to be applied in the great works of administration and government."

We are glad to observe that a movement has at last taken shape among the "canny" Aberdonians to institute a suitable memorial for the late Dr. W. A. Hunter, M.P. for North Aberdeen—"to perpetuate his name and keep alive the memory of his great abilities and public services." Well, Dr. Hunter took care to do that much for himself by his work in Jurisprudence and Roman Law and by his strenuous and successful—publicly, if not privately, successful—labours in Parliament. However, it is well that his fellow townsmen should even now do something to purge their strange neglect. Their ambition is modest: they propose to provide a Gold Medal and Prize in the department of Roman Law in Aberdeen University to be called the "William A. Hunter Medal and Prize." We are pleased to see that the subscriptions are coming in pretty freely, and we have no doubt that many Indians will be glad to seize the opportunity of showing their respect and gratitude to the memory of a man that cherished the warmest interest in them and in their country. Subscriptions should be sent to Mr. J. B. Rennet, hon. secretary and treasurer of the Hunter Memorial Committee, 81, Union Street, Aberdeen.

Lord Stanley of Alderley has again, and very properly, drawn attention to the pending reorganisation of the court for Indian appeals in this country, and to the importance of the close examination of the subject in India and the formulation of a considered opinion. He writes to the "Pioneer" (September 27) that in his opinion "the danger of making the House of Lords the Court of Appeal for India and the Colonies has gone by," and that "the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council only requires strengthening." So far we agree with Lord Stanley. For the rest, he goes on to revive his suggestion that, instead of one legal expert from India at £6,000 a year, there had better be five at £1,200. "The essential point," he says, "is that most of these assessors should be Indians." We object to "most"; we say "all." However, let us quote again from Lord Stanley's letter to the "Morning Post" of June 11, 1900 (India, vol. xiii, p. 282):—

It has been suggested to me that it would be better, instead of spending £6,000 a year on one assessor, to spend it in creating six assessors in place of the two created by the Act of 1833. . . . . The larger number would ensure a greater amount of experience and more varied knowledge of different parts of India and of the different schools of law.

In criticism of Lord Stanley's revived suggestion we content ourselves with reviving the remarks we made upon it originally (India, vol. xiii, p. 282):—

We must, with regret, but with decision, at once say that we entirely disagree with Lord Stanley. . . . . No doubt half-a-dozen assessors from half-a-dozen provinces of India would bring to the counsels of the Committee a greater amount of experience and more varied knowledge of different districts and of the different schools of law. But surely this project is wholly chimerical. Even if the Government were ready and willing to appoint six assessors, where is the possibility of obtaining six adequate candidates? No Indian worthy of the post would dream of renouncing his income and his Native land for £1,000 a year. But one good man is amply sufficient for all the present purposes. A first-rate Indian barrister has an adequate grasp of the principles of all the systems of law, and an adequate knowledge of the ways of his countrymen; and he would have plenty of opportunity to fill up any gaps of detail which might emerge in any given case.

We may just add that, as Lord Stanley's five Indian assessors would be judges not only of Indian but of Colonial appeals also, the Committee would be overbalanced by their number—a single fact that seems more than sufficient to exclude the suggestion from the sphere of practical conceptions. Still, Lord Stanley's persistence in keeping the proposed reorganisation of the Committee in view is wholly laudable.

An Anglo-Indian writes:—"It will be remembered that about two years ago there was placed before the Secretary of State in Council a Memorial in which evidence was adduced and cogent arguments were urged to the effect that judicial and executive functions should not be jointly exercised by the same persons or classes of administrators. This Memorial was signed mainly by men of experience and weight, who have occupied positions of high judicial rank in India. Lord George Hamilton, at the time, undertook, at once, to place the Memorial, with its very important appendices, before the Government of India. In course of the Session before last his lordship, in response to a question in Parliament, stated that the whole subject had by the Governor-General been referred, in the usual course, to be minuted upon by the local authorities throughout India. Those mills, as we know, grind slowly, and not always so surely as public interests demand.

"From that day not a word had been heard from inside the huge machine until, about a month ago, what may be described as a creaky sound was heard in one of the Calcutta newspaper offices. Some brief phonographic version indicating the sort of grinding going on inside the Secretariats in their efforts to 'dispose of' the 1898 Memorial, appeared on the front page of India, October 4. Thereupon, an Anglo-Indian correspondent wrote to me as follows:—

It is rather unlucky that the very first hints as to the opinions of the provincial administrations on the long delayed separation of Judicial from Executive functions should be those that purport to be from the Bengal Government; that is if these views are at all likely to influence any other local administrators who might not already have finally reported. Some of the younger Secretariat-wallas (and there are many juniors in these days) cannot know, so well as you and I, that the Bengal Government is THE hardened sinner as regards the vital question of Indian administration. That it should, in that character, kick against the cogent case set forth in the memorial was only to be expected: so the outside public should be put on its guard against any report the Calcutta Secretariat may be sending in on this subject. It must be regarded at best as the statement of the 'advocatus diaboli' in this matter. Nay, further, its position is that of an accused person who, under modern regulations in our criminal courts here, is allowed, at his peril, to proffer evidence in his own case. It is said that in its report 'even the High Court Judges who have favoured the proposal for separation do not escape criticism.' One can well believe this—it is so like Pompey! Sir John Woodburn and his colleagues may feel encouraged in this factious course seeing that—as shown in a recent notorious episode of irregularities—they have found a more pliable Chief Justice to deal with than those grave and reverend seniors whom they dare to disparage. Again, the value of their opposition may be estimated when it is said they have 'consulted an ex-Inspector-General of Police whose official experience of India terminated eighteen years ago.' It may be a slight sign of grace if the Bengal Government admit that District Magistrates, that is revenue Collectors and police-masters, should not interfere during the trial of cases by their subordinates. How much does this admission imply? However, the (young) Legal Member of the Supreme Executive and the Secretary of State alike are now forewarned what sort of aid they are likely to get from the present Bengal Government whose Chief Secretary is Mr. Bourdillon."

It is a curious commentary on the belief in British justice in India that a magistrate who acts impartially between Indian and European becomes a popular hero. Some-

thing of the kind has befallen Mr. Forrester, the Joint Magistrate of Mymensingh. Mr. Basil, Agent at the place for the Nehapit Jute Company had a quarrel with a dewan under him. He accordingly accused the dewan of threatening to take his life by means of a sword, and had him arrested and put on his trial. Mr. Forrester, however, decided in favour of the accused. He found that Mr. Basil abused him, and went towards him quickly as if to eject him. The accused then fetched a sword and half drew it, but sheathed it again when Mr. Basil desisted. Mr. Forrester continued as follows: "I hold that accused acted in a most temperate manner. He is a man of some self-respect, and he never returned the abuse. He had a reasonable apprehension of the use of force, and had absolute right of self-defence." But many Indians seem surprised that a magistrate should do justice against another European.

The inhabitants of Salsette—or 1,200 of them, for there was no time to collect more signatures—have memorialised the Government of India, as so many other places have done, to withhold its assent from the Bombay Land Revenue Act. The feeling of the Salsette people with regard to the objects of Government is, unfortunately, yet naturally enough, that the Government intends (1) to take every opportunity to wrench away the permanent occupancy rights of the rayats, and to constitute itself the direct landlord, (2) to drive as much land as possible as early as possible into the hands of moneylenders, and (3) generally, to be able through the new legislation to raise enhanced revenues one way or another from the land. This is a very bad impression to convey by new legislation, even if it were an unjust impression. Five out of the nine clauses of the Statement of Objects and Reasons attached to the Bill spoke of "removing doubts"; and the Salsette Memorialists urge that "the most proper and reasonable course would have been to refer the doubts for the opinions of independent and learned Judges of the High Court, and the several Judges of the District Courts," and not to have the doubts (if any) resolved by the Government of Bombay "in their own favour so easily and in the manner adopted." They do not indeed admit that there were any such doubts. They complain very strongly of "the purposely loose and fearfully uncertain wording of the 'amendments'," in the operation of which they foresee great danger to the rayats. They express regret for the refusal of Mr. Mehta's amendment, which proposed the reference of the Bill "for opinion of all District Judges, Collectors, and Commissioners of the Presidency, the Chief Justice and the Judges of the High Court of Bombay, etc."; and they recall the Regulating Act of 1773, and the Act of 1854 as good precedents. Why, there was a time in England when Acts of Parliament were sent to the Judges for revision before being put in operation—a practice that would even now and here save a vast amount of judicial labour and worry and expense to suitors.

Salsette prays the Viceroy also "to discourage the eagerness for 'discretionary powers' and their use, and allow free and unfettered and without artificial, unnecessary, and frequent interference of superficial enactments, as far as may be, the play, process, and action of general economic laws." The people "look upon this 'discretion' with feelings of the greatest alarm for their honest and legal interests." They shrink before "the whims and arbitrariness (which are the proper synonyms of 'discretion' at present in this relation) of individual officials of descriptions of temperaments, prejudices, attainments, and abilities." We quote Mr. Justice Cuningham: "No change is less popular than a proposal to remove any class of rights or claims from the jurisdiction of the Courts to the discretion of executive officers." They quote Sir James Stephen: "Government by law is the only real security for life and property"; and "discretion" given by law still remains "discretion." And, as "J." has pointed out in the "Times of India," nowhere in British India, "not even in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, are these matters"—that is, matters of land tenure—"left to the unfettered discretion of the local executive." The new Act is based on the idea of rescuing the rayat from indebtedness, and this indebtedness is assumed to arise from his "recklessness," which again is mainly caused by "the grant of unrestricted property in land." The Memorialists strenuously contend against this chain of unsupported assumptions. They point out that the rayat struggles to retrieve in good seasons the mortgages inevitably conceded in bad seasons, and similarly to pay off arrears and debts. This is no sign of "recklessness." The Famine Commission go against the theory, and hold "that if the right of transfer was restricted the agriculturist would have no stimulus to raise himself or improve his position." Besides, the part played by famine in Bombay since 1895-96, when there was "practically a clean balance sheet," speaks for itself. We have little hope that the Memorialists will be listened to, but their arguments will one day find deplorable justification in the facts of the agrarian situation.

We understand that the London Indian Society proposes to hold a conference on November 23, in order to adopt a Memorial to the Secretary of State for India against the Bombay Land Revenue Code Amendment Act which has been passed by the Bombay Council in spite of the opposition of the Indian public. The measure received the assent of Lord Curzon on September 24.

The Earl of Ronaldshay, late A.D.C. to Lord Curzon, lately travelled over the new Nuski-Sistan route, and has just confided to Reuter's Agency some of his experiences. The route has been open only three or four years, and, says the Earl, "if trade progresses at its present rate, it may lead to the construction of a railway which will accomplish for Anglo-Indian trade what the Trans-Caspian line has done for Russia." Though it has been said that Lord Curzon has already solved this problem, Lord Ronaldshay was "unable to say if a railway from Quetta to the Persian border has been agreed to." Throughout his journey he "found that, while appreciating the superior quality of British and Anglo-Indian goods, the Persians were more or less obliged to purchase Russian goods owing to their greater cheapness." This is occasioned "by the great facilities that Russia possesses for flooding the Persian market from the North, from her base on the Trans-Caspian railway, with goods far cheaper than could possibly be imported from India." In Sistan the merchants are keenly alive to the advantages of the new route, and Lord Ronaldshay says they often asked him if the Indian Government could not extend the line from Quetta in that direction. A railway would, no doubt, be all to the good: the difficulty lies in the providing of it, and the proposals will have to be carefully scrutinised. This is no time, at least, to burden the Indian rayat with it.

Mr. J. M. Parikh, Barrister-at-Law, will address meetings as follows:—

Nov. 3.—Labour Church, Watford, on "India, Past and Present," at 8 p.m.

Nov. 10.—South Place Institute, South Place, Finsbury, E.C., at 4 p.m., on "Village Communities of India."

Nov. 12.—Uxbridge, Middlesex, on "Village Communities of India."

Nov. 28.—At 8 p.m., at North London Jewish Literary and Social Union, will lead a debate on "India through Indian Spectacles," in opposition to "India through English Spectacles."

Dec. 8.—Brixton Discussion Forum, Raleigh College Hall, Effra Road, Brixton, S.W., at 11.15 a.m., on "The White Man's Burden."

Dec. 15.—A Church off Harrow Road, at 8 p.m., on "Village Communities of India."

Jan. 13, 1902.—Anerley Congregational Church Literary and Debating Society, Anerley, S.E., at 8 p.m., on "Village Communities of India."

Jan. 29.—The Church, Pelly Road, Plaistow, Essex, at 8 p.m., on "The Condition of the Working Classes in India." Lantern slides will be used to illustrate the lecture.

Remittances on India for 50 lakhs were on Wednesday offered for tender by the India Council, and applications amounting to Rs.14,79,75,000 were received at prices ranging from 1s. 3d. and 31-32nds to 1s. 4d. and 1-32nd. The following amounts were allotted, viz.:—In bills, Rs.27,53,000 on Calcutta, Rs.11,25,000 on Bombay, and Rs.69,000 on Madras, all at an average of 1s. 4d.; and in telegraphic transfers Rs.10,53,000 on Calcutta at an average of 1s. 4.031d. Tenders for bills at 1s. 4d. and for transfers at 1s. 4d. and 1-32nd will receive about 81 per cent. Last week remittances for Rs.50,10,000 were disposed of for £333,630, making the total sold from April 1 to Tuesday night Rs.11,33,73,987, producing £7,530,005. Next week 50 lakhs will again be offered.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON VERSUS JOHN STUART MILL.

A CORRESPONDENT has lately given Lord George Hamilton an opportunity of reiterating his views on the economic soundness of the relations between England and India. The correspondent had seen in a newspaper a reference to the economic tribute paid by India to England, and he asked whether that did not in great part consist of interest on money invested in railways and other works of public utility. The reply sent in Lord George Hamilton's name, and printed in our last issue, was worthy of his statesmanship. In spite of the disappearance of famine in one European country after another where there has been no change of climate, but only a change from poverty to wealth, he declares that "famine is attributable to climatic conditions." Of the tribute, he only refers to one part—that spent on useful public works. It is obvious that the railways have not prevented famine. It is a question whether the expenditure on railways has not in a sense increased famine by increasing poverty, so that the railways have only succeeded in softening the distress which they have had their share in causing. This, we say, is a question. What is certain is that the interest on debt incurred to make railways, whether productive or unproductive, civil or military, is only a small portion of the whole amount which has to be paid by India in Europe, and which must be provided by the export of goods from India without economic return. In other words, after the Indians have exported sufficient to pay for their imports, they must export an additional quantity to satisfy this demand, made up of the interest on debt (for whatever purpose incurred) the expenses of the India Office, and the pensions and allowances, military and civil, which are the necessary accompaniment of alien rule.

It is Lord George Hamilton's fashion to treat the theory of the drain from India as an absurd economic heresy, springing up in the imagination of those whose aim is to find fault with that unparalleled creation of human wisdom, the British Government of India. He speaks of the theory as so absurd that it could only have originated in ignorant and untrained minds, seeking for a support to their malice. Who would think to hear the denunciations of the Secretary of State for India that the drain of wealth from which India has long suffered was first noticed by servants of the British Government, and has been affirmed by a succession of able and trusted administrators? In Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji's book entitled the "Poverty of India," lately published, there is a long list of these utterances, beginning with that of Sir John Shore in 1787, and including those of Lord Cornwallis, Governor-General of India, and of Civilians like Mr. Marriot, and Sir J. Lawrence. Notable among these opinions is that of Sir George Wingate in 1859, who is not afraid to use the word "tribute." After a description of its nature, he goes on to say: "From this explanation some faint conception may be formed of the cruel, crushing effect of the tribute upon India"; and again: "The Indian tribute, whether weighed in the scale of justice or viewed in the light of our interests will be found at variance with humanity, with commonsense, and with the received maxims of political science." Such are the men whose views on a question of great moment Lord George Hamilton flouts. It is assuredly true that wise administrators may be woefully mistaken on a point of economic theory. But their opinion is at least entitled to be weighed with respect. What is there in the career of Lord George Hamilton that gives him the right to treat with contempt the matured conviction of Sir J. Lawrence and Sir G. Wingate?

But if Lord George Hamilton appeals from the intimate knowledge and the administrative experience of men like these to the writings of the economists, he fares no better. Many, indeed, have not treated this by-way of economic theory, but one of the greatest has given it his particular attention. We do not for a moment propose that economic questions should be decided by the reputations of rival economists. If we did, it is to be feared that Lord George Hamilton would cut a very poor figure beside John Stuart Mill. We propose rather to consider the arguments with which that eminent man supported his thesis.

In chapter xxi of the 3rd book of his "Principles of Political Economy," John Stuart Mill treats of "the distribution of the precious metals through the commercial world." In the fourth and last section of the chapter, he deals with international payments not originating in commerce, payments for which no equivalent in money or commodities is expected or received. As instances of such payments he gives (1) a direct tribute, (2) remittances of rent to absentee landlords, (3) interest to foreign creditors, and (4) Government expenditure abroad in the management of colonial dependencies which do not pay their own expenses. As the simplest example, Mill first supposes the case to be one of barter, no money passing, and the payments being made directly in goods. The annual remittance, the effect of which we are considering, is therefore made in commodities for which no other commodities are given in return. The imports and the exports will not balance one another, as in the case of two nations neither of which is tributary to the other, but there must be an annual excess of exports equal to the value of the remittance. In a natural state of equilibrium, then, the exports and the imports should balance. For one country to make a payment without economic return it must induce its customers to take more exports than are equivalent to its imports, and this can only be done by offering its exports on cheaper terms, or in other words, by paying dearer for foreign commodities. Mr. Mill continues:—

> The international values will so adjust themselves that either by greater exports, or smaller imports, or both, the requisite excess on the side of exports will be brought about; and this excess will become the permanent state. The result is that a country which makes regular payments to foreign countries, besides losing what it pays, loses also something more, by the less advantageous terms on which it is forced to exchange its productions for foreign commodities.

Mr. Mill has no difficulty in showing that the intervention of money makes no difference. If commerce be supposed in a state of equilibrium when the obligatory remittances begin, the first remittance must be made in money.

> This lowers prices in the remitting country, and raises them in the receiving. The natural effect is that more commodities are exported than before and fewer imported, and that on the score of commerce alone, a balance of money will be constantly due from the receiving to the paying country. When the debt thus annually due to the tributary country becomes equal to the annual tribute or other regular payment due from it, no further transmission of money takes place.

In fact, "the tribute or remittance will now be virtually paid in goods," and as in the case of barter already considered "the paying country will give a higher price for all that it buys from the receiving country, while the latter, besides receiving the tribute, obtains the exportable produce of the tributary country at a lower price."

So much for the economic theory of a regular remittance or tribute as expounded by John Stuart Mill. Three questions remain: (a) Do the payments made by India come under this head of an economic tribute? (b) How is it that although the payments to be made vary but slightly, there is a considerable variation from year to year in the excess of exports over imports? and (c) How far are Mill's conclusions invalidated when the debts on which interest has to be paid were originally incurred for productive works which minister to the economic prosperity of the country? These questions must be dealt with in turn.

As to the first, there can be little doubt. Part of the remittance is for paying interest on debt, one of the very instances given by Mill. The other is for expenses of administration either in England or in India. The cost of the India Office in London is exactly similar to the case, also instanced by Mill, of payments for the management of dependencies. In the one case, a European Government pays the salary of officials in (let us suppose) a West India Island, in the other India pays the salaries of officials in an office in London. Both are supposed, rightly or wrongly, to gain something, but what they gain is never an economic return for the expenditure. The goods remitted to make the payment are represented by no goods returned to India. The same is true of the payments made in England for pensions, and the like. Such return as there may be is represented by the advantages of being governed by skilled alien administrators, who spend their pensions in another land. This may be worth the money, but the economic effect is the same. The exports must exceed the imports, and the market must be forced in order that they may do so.

But it is objected that the excess of exports is not always the same; and, therefore, is not always the exact equivalent of the payments to be made in London. As, for the most part, it varies within narrow limits, it would follow that this variation would disappear if sufficiently long periods were taken. But occasionally it falls much below the normal. In the year 1898-1899, the excess of exports over imports exceeded £30,000,000. In the preceding year it was less than £8,000,000. In fact, that being a year of famine, the country could not export enough to make up the usual remittances. But the payments were made all the same. The excess of exports not being sufficient, the future had to be mortgaged. Temporary or permanent loans had to be contracted in London—the repayment of which or the yearly interest would be a new tribute imposed on India in the future. By borrowing, the tribute due in that particular year was shifted on to future years. Lastly, there is the question whether the purpose for which the loan was raised alters the economic effect of the interest. Lord George Hamilton speaks as if this were the main point. But of the whole tribute only a part, and that not the largest part, is due to interest on loans, and of the amounts paid as interest on loans, only a part is for works even nominally productive. The amount paid as interest on the money borrowed for the construction of railways is thus only the fraction of a fraction of the total tribute. A part of the debt has been incurred for military purposes, and another part to make up the payments due in London; while of the railways constructed some are military rather than civil in their object. But even in regard to those which are productive and useful to the people of India, it still remains true that the interest on the loans constitutes a part of the remittances made to England without a return in commodities. To make these remittances requires a forcing of the market, and so obliges India to exchange its productions on less favourable terms. It may even then be advisable to make railroads with capital borrowed abroad, but the cost must be estimated not only by the interest paid, but also by the loss on foreign trade due to the interest having to be paid abroad. Such expenditure on railways requires therefore to be defended in each case, and can never, as Lord George Hamilton seems to think, be an excuse for other expenditure which by no possibility can be regarded as productive.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

WESTMINSTER, Thursday.

Our Cabinet of Twenty met on Monday and made up for two months of idleness by two hours' devotion to business. What happened nobody outside the sacred circle is supposed to know. Nevertheless, the gossips have told us all that happened. There was talk about South Africa—how unexpected!—about Sir Redvers Buller, about income and expenditure, and about the legislative programme for next Session. One wonders whether there was also any talk about the Cabinet Council of last week—the Council that was summoned, postponed, and postponed again. Lord Salisbury still plays the autocrat in unimportant things. Coming home last Wednesday, the Prime Minister found that some enterprising colleague, doubtless a relative, had committed him to attendance at a meeting of the Cabinet on the following day. Two Cabinet Ministers had cancelled public engagements in order to be present, whereupon, with the grim humour of which he is a master, Lord Salisbury cancelled the Cabinet Council. The incident, though trivial in itself, reflects the operation within the Government of a divided authority.

Politicians continue to mark time. Neither Mr. Chamberlain nor Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman had anything fresh to say in the speeches to which people were looking forward with some eagerness a week ago. The Colonial Secretary harped on his lute-string—the depravity of the Pro-Boers. He admitted that many blunders had been committed and put the blame on the Government's military advisers, and in the same breath advanced claims on behalf of himself, his colleagues, and their military advisers equivalent to a declaration of Ministerial infallibility. The speech disappointed Mr. Chamberlain's admirers. One passage only afforded them satisfaction—that in which he threatened the enemy with "severer measures." This expression would almost seem to imply that the Government are beginning to realise the necessity of dealing with the Boers. Hitherto they have expended their energies in scolding the Pro-Boers.

Lord Milner has again been indulging in picturesque rhetoric, much of which had better have been left unsaid. He deprecates speechmaking and preaches the gospel of silence with a volubility which has long characterised its apostles. Patience is his new panacea for the maladies of South Africa. Two years ago he mentioned that particular physic only to advise that it should be thrown to the dogs of war. More remarkable than the utterances of either Lord Milner or Mr. Chamberlain on this subject is the long letter sent by Mr. Steyn to Lord Kitchener last August, in which the Boer point of view is explained with a lucidity and moderation worthy of an impartial historian. If the British Government are confident of success, it is evident from this document that the Boers are equally sceptical of failure. They believe, indeed—or, at all events, they believed last August—that time is with them, and that their cause is invincible. Downing Street replies that they are the victims of a delusion which must soon be dissipated; but inasmuch as Downing Street itself has proved to be a nest of false prophets the public would prefer to see the evidence. This they are not likely to get, for, as the "Morning Post" says, the War Office regards the war as a private affair of its own.

Popular excitement over the Buller affair is beginning to cool down. Sir Redvers Buller himself has betrayed no sign of resentment. On the other hand, he has used his influence in a quiet way to restrain the more extravagant ebullitions of his sympathisers. Nevertheless, it is understood that in due time he will bring his defence before the world and challenge judgment between himself and his traducers. Meanwhile, the popularity of the disgraced soldier is unbounded. Speeches by Lord Roberts are followed by cheers for General Buller. The music-halls have restored him to the pedestal of song, from which he was deposed after the disaster of Colenso. Many people, too, have revived the obsolete practice of wearing "Buller buttons" in honour of Mr. Brodrick's scapegoat. So extreme a revulsion of feeling is without parallel even in the violent oscillations of emotion that have characterised the war fever.

Under the circumstances, one can understand how it is that a Government which seems to be largely composed of election agents should be beginning to tremble for the future and to devise methods of propitiating the popular idol. Another incident of the discussion which deserves remark was the appearance in the "Times" last Saturday of a long cablegram giving an epitome of the opinion of the Indian press on the subject. The quotations, showing, as they did, that Anglo-Indian feeling appeared to be almost entirely on the side of General Buller, attracted wide attention and undoubtedly deepened the impression that the Government had blundered. Needless to say, Ministers have since been saddling Lord Roberts with the responsibility.

Wild rumours have been current lately with regard to the health of the King. Hitherto no official notice has been taken of those sinister reports, although there can be no question as to their injurious effect on certain branches of trade. His Majesty is in close touch with popular feeling, and he probably knows quite well that some anxiety has been caused by the whispers of the gossip-mongers. At all events, he has done his best to counteract the mischief by courting the public gaze and exhibiting himself, so to speak, as a model of kingly health. Thus at the beginning of the week he was driving in an open carriage through the streets of Windsor, and next day was delighting the people of London by taking them into his confidence in similar fashion. To-day his Majesty proceeds to Portsmouth to welcome the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall on their return from a world-wide tour of the British Colonies, and for the next three days he will be living in the full blaze of publicity. If anything can, this, surely, will silence the ominous whisperings of the quidnuncs.

Londoners had almost forgotten what fog was like, till in a rash moment some good people decided about a week ago to quicken the public memory by appointing a committee to enquire into the phenomena of the extinct plague. Scarcely had the word been uttered when the elements combined to offer us a sample of the article. Next day's

papers made pleasant reading. Accidents had happened by the score, and robberies also. The fog descended so rapidly that people were caught as in a trap. Cabs collided with one another and cannoned against lampposts, while huge, lumbering omnibuses stuck helplessly in the middle of the street like stranded whales. Ladies emerging in thin wraps from the theatres searched in vain for their carriages, and had no alternative but to grope their way home, escorted in many instances by spectral link-boys, miraculously resuscitated on their behalf from the forgotten ashes of the torch period.

Several new plays have been produced at West-end theatres within the last few days, but not one that shows any promise of amusing posterity. Mr. Beerbohm Tree gives a finished study of an early Victorian beau in "The Last of the Dandies," a costume play constructed with little art by Mr. Clyde Fitch. The production rivals Mr. Vincent Crummles's famous experiment in realism, for not only is real water introduced in a river scene, but some of the dialogue is a repetition of words actually spoken once upon a time by real personages who themselves are represented under their real names. Quite different from this tedious mimicry is Mr. H. V. Esmond's fantastic drama "The Sentimentalist," produced a few nights ago at the Duke of York's Theatre. Unfortunately, the imaginative work of Mr. Esmond, owing to the uncurbed ambition of a dramatist who has yet to find his feet, is almost as unsatisfactory as the manufactured product of Mr. Fitch's industry. The stage indeed is singularly barren in good plays just now. Mrs. Clifford's "Likeness of the Night" is another disappointment. It may fill the St. James's Theatre, but if it does it will be due chiefly to the fine emotional acting of Mrs. Kendal in the part of a misunderstood wife.

NOTES FROM BOMBAY.

THE AMIR ABDUR RAHMAN.

[From an Indian Correspondent.]

Bombay, October 12.

The most important event of the week—possibly the seed of political complication in Central Asia—is the lamented death of the Amir of Afghanistan. For full twenty years this masterful potentate has ruled Afghanistan with an iron hand, and maintained peace and order in his dominions, formerly for centuries the scene of carnage and tragedy. The British in India desire to have a strong and faithful ally in the Amir, whoever he may be. But no Afghan ruler can ever be strong unless he rules as a despot, with none of the Western notions of autocracy, not even such as are known in Russia, to suggest qualms of conscience. A turbulent people, born warriors, with hereditary blood-feuds, and an irrepressible spirit, a people with all the qualities which develop endurance, and the power to resist hardship, and religiously imbued with the spirit of "Kismet"—such a people can never be governed in the ways which the civilisation of the West dictates. Inured to a rigorous life in their own mountain fastnesses, natural bulwarks against outward foes, careless of life and even of domestic ties save so far as the dictates of self-interest may prompt, the Afghans need a tyrant to rule them. But when with such tyranny there is coupled astute statesmanship, such as Abdur Rahman displayed, the Amir is well able to enforce his will, keep all on their good behaviour, inspire wholesome dread of his rule, and maintain peace and order. In such a combination of circumstances alone can the British Indian Government expect a strong and independent Afghanistan. That ideal the late Amir realised with beneficent results to himself and to the British. Possessed of arts of diplomacy that might excite the envy of a Gortschakoff or a Bismarck, he was able to play off the two great foreign powers one against the other, and preserve his independence and integrity. The Amir has never been known to "kowtow" to the English or to the Russian. He had an ample sense of self-respect, and he gave Lord Lansdowne once an excellent taste of it. On the side of the British it is sometimes forgotten that if the policy is to be one of a strong and independent Afghanistan, it is essential that the Viceroy or the chief of his Foreign Office should have the most tactful manner. They must not be supercilious, nor act the bully. But for the conduct and attitude of the India Foreign Office towards the ill-fated Shere Ali, in the time of Lord Lytton, there would never have arisen the Ali Musjid incident. Sir Neville Chamberlain could tell the British public how the second Afghan War might have been averted. England should never forget that even to a semi-barbarous Asiatic potentate is due a certain civility and courtesy in diplomacy. To disregard it is to court needless disaster. However, the Amir is now dead. The British Indian Government was fortunate in that he was ruler of Afghanistan for 20 years. As to the future, it is perhaps premature to speak. But much statesmanship, forbearance, and generosity will be needed on the part of the British Indian Government to strengthen the position of Habibulla Khan, who has by common consent been raised to the Gadi. Let us hope internal and external complications may be few and harmless.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

Thursday, October 24.—Some hundreds of letters of sympathy reached General Buller at Aldershot, and the Falmouth Corporation passed a vote of confidence in him.

The Bishop of Hereford in addressing the Diocesan Conference referred to the war. A hundred years ago, he said, the nation was bracing itself for battle on behalf of national liberties against the greatest military Imperialist of modern history. In that mighty struggle England was the protagonist of national freedom. To-day we were spending our resources and risking our prestige—material and moral—on the side of the Imperialists and against the small nations. We seemed to have lost the admiration, respect, and gratitude of those lesser peoples of Europe that used to look up to us as their friend and model, and we had increased the dislike of all the greater peoples. However we regarded the war, it was a cruel task that had been laid on England that she, the land of freedom and protector of small nations, should begin the new century by wiping out two small communities of brave and resolute if misguided men, one of those communities having been the best governed and the happiest on all the continent of Africa. It was a repugnant task that had been imposed on our soldiers, and it required no prophet to tell us that the condemnation of history would lie very heavy on those men who had brought the country into such a hateful necessity, whether they were Boer or Briton.

Mr. Wyndham, Chief Secretary for Ireland, speaking at Bradford, said there was no room for doubt as to the terms on which alone the war in South Africa could be finished, and we must continue to fight till the task was accomplished. The Government were doing everything suggested to them by the best military advisers with a view to bring the conflict to a close at the earliest possible date, and were giving Lord Kitchener all that he asked for to enable him to carry out his military plans. As to Ireland, the Government desired to give further facilities for voluntary land purchase, and to do all that was possible in order that Ireland might make the most of her natural resources and the intellectual capacity of her people.

Friday, October 25.—Speaking at Stirling, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman attributed the slow progress of the war in South Africa to the fact that the tone and spirit in which it had been conducted had been essentially wrong, and had made for inevitable discord instead of for peace. Any one who appreciated the fact that these men whom we were fighting were to be our fellow-citizens in the future would say that our object ought to be to impose upon our antagonists our military superiority and to impress upon them our ultimate and essential friendliness towards them. It was a worthy object to turn brave foemen into staunch friends, but our Ministers had barred the way. South Africa had been reduced to a howling wilderness. The burning of farms and laying waste the country he had already described as "methods of barbarism," and he adhered to the phrase. The universal treatment of a whole country in that way and the sweeping of women and children into camps was a process for which nothing could furnish justification. The policy of the Government was really one of subjugation and annihilation. Was it too late even now to hope for counsels of moderation and a statesmanship which should revert to the great traditions which had bound Great Britain and her colonies together? Proceeding to refer to the Irish question, Sir Henry said the present disaffection would never be removed by any amount of forcing and driving or bribing and wheedling, but only by generous confidence, and he was as strongly as ever in favour of giving self-government to Ireland.

Mr. Chamberlain, at Edinburgh, said he did not expect any assistance from the Opposition in dealing with Irish rowdyism and obstruction; but the Government proposed to

alter the arrangements of the House of Commons so as to enable its business to be done better and to have a greater control over the men who tried to degrade it. Mr. Chamberlain proceeded to contend that the war in South Africa had been forced on this country by the action of the Boers; that it was just and necessary, and could not have been avoided; that the terms offered to the Boers were more liberal than had ever before been tendered to a beaten foe, and that, as they had been refused, the struggle must be carried on to the end and a settlement attained which would render impossible a recurrence of the danger from which we had escaped.

Mr. Walter Long, M.P., President of the Local Government Board, made a speech at Liverpool in defence of the action of the War Office and the Cabinet in superseding General Buller. He said that it rested with the Commander-in-Chief to do what he thought right in order that the discipline of the army might be maintained. After every opportunity had been offered to Sir Redvers to make his explanation, and to justify, if he could, the course he had taken, and after the most anxious—he might almost say agonised—consideration, the Commander-in-Chief arrived deliberately and clearly at his conclusion, and on his advice the Secretary for War, with the entire concurrence and support of the Cabinet, acted in the only manner possible in the circumstances.

SATURDAY, October 26.—The "Manchester Guardian" wrote:—Neither General Buller's friends nor his enemies will be much moved by those "agonised considerations" of which Mr. Walter Long spoke yesterday. As the Cabinet approved of the dismissal, there is something at once unseemly and ridiculous in this public parade of its private agonies. According to Mr. Long, the speech and the speech only was the cause; but he adds that every opportunity was given to General Buller to make explanations. It is not easy to reconcile these two statements. If the speech only was the cause, there was nothing to explain; for, foolish and indiscreet as it was, every line of it was perfectly sincere and straightforward. A more serious mistake was the prominence given to the part taken by Lord Roberts in the affair. There was no reason why his name should have been introduced either in the announcement of General Buller's dismissal or even in Mr. Long's description of the "agonised considerations." It is quite untrue to say, as Mr. Long did, that it rested with the Commander-in-Chief to do what he thought right to maintain discipline. The discipline of the army is in the province not of the Commander-in-Chief but of the Adjutant-General, and it rests neither with the one nor the other to do anything of this nature, but only to advise the Secretary for War. He alone is responsible to the country; they merely offer advice, which he is quite free to accept or reject.

MONDAY, October 28.—The first meeting of the Cabinet since the prorogation in August was held. All the twenty members were present, and the Council lasted two and a half hours.

TUESDAY, October 29.—Commenting on the appalling mortality in the concentration camps in South Africa, the "Manchester Guardian" wrote:—There are two ways of dealing with these facts, which are known and could not but be known to the whole world, and which are making the name of England, still dear to many of us, a byword throughout the world. The one way is to break out into rage at any mention of them, to abuse the outer world for speaking of them, to abuse still more loudly every Englishman who says aloud what every Englishman feels in his heart—that they are abominable. The other way is to change them. We would ask everyone who feels that patriotism is really a virtue, and that one really owes some special duty to one's country and not merely to one's family within it and to humanity around it—we would ask him to try to think of this matter now, while its issue is still unmoulded, as men will think of it in a hundred years, when it will be asked dispassionately whether we did what we could in our generation to make our country's figure in history lofty and worthy of love. Is there any Englishman now who would not move heaven and earth to save Joan of Arc from being burned if, knowing what he now knows, he could by some miracle be transported back to live his life at the time when his country was being daubed with that dishonour? We cannot go back, but we can go forward; if we try hard enough, our minds can reach out beyond the little momentary mess of party shouts and nicknames to the time when it will be a terribly simple question whether, when nearly one out of every two of our enemy's children in our hands was dying preventably in a year, we did anything or nothing to prevent it. Compared with a question like this, the question whether for the moment he will be praised or hooted by either political party, or by thoughtless and excitable people of no particular party, must seem to a sincere patriot indescribably small.

Mr. Chamberlain, speaking at Cupar, said that no war in the history of the world had ever been conducted with greater humanity than that now being waged in South Africa. He believed it would have been over long before now but for the action of misguided persons in this country who led the Boers to believe that Great Britain would grow tired of the struggle. The nation and the Government, however, would not abate a jot of their resolution, and would not lay down their arms till there was no doubt of the future of South Africa under the British flag. Speaking later in the day at a meeting held in Edinburgh, Mr. Chamberlain said there was one sense in which they were all Imperialists. There was no one who was not proud of what their countrymen had done in carrying civilization, order, justice, and religion to the distant corners of the earth.

Mr. A. R. Jelf, K.C., was appointed a Judge of the King's Bench Division of the High Court in the room of Mr. Justice Day, retired.

Lord Kitchener, in a telegram of yesterday, said that the columns reported since October 21, 74 Boers killed, 16 wounded, 352 prisoners, and 45 surrenders, with the capture of 471 rifles, 75,950 rounds of ammunition, 216 wagons, 530 horses, and 8,000 cattle. Major Rimington, on the night of October 23, made a long march on Schemmelhoek, east of Ermelo, where Louis Botha was reported to be with 300 men, but the Boers fled northward an hour before his arrival. Some of Botha's documents were captured. Lord Methuen reported a severe action between Von Donop's column and commandos under Delarey and Kemp on October 24 near the Great Marico River. The Boers attacked with great determination, but were repulsed after hard fighting, leaving 40 dead, including a commandant, on the ground. The British losses were also heavy; two officers and 26 men were killed, five officers and 50 men wounded, and the enemy captured eight wagons. Lord Milner, speaking at Durban yesterday, said the war was burning itself out.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

DROUGHT-RESISTING FODDER PLANTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF "INDIA."

Sir,—I have had an interesting correspondence with Mr. Robert H. Elliot, well known as the Mysore planter, regarding the great usefulness of those deep-rooting drought-resisting plants which may be used as fodder for cattle when there is a failure of rain. He has supplied me with the annexed list of plants growing on the Nilgiris, upon which cattle browse. This list was furnished by Mr. Charles Gray, of Coonoor; and no doubt each locality in India has similar plants known to the local people. I believe the Government of India have made enquiry into this matter, and published the results; but looking to the great loss of cattle in recent famines the subject appears to be now specially deserving of public attention.

Speaking of his own experiments in Scotland (Clifton Park, Kelso) Mr. Elliot says:—

> The wonderful success I have obtained here with the aid of deep-rooting drought-resisting plants which I have added to the grass mixtures (vide my "Agricultural Changes and Laying Down Land to Grass," Messrs. J. and J. H. Rutherford, Kelso, 1901, price 2s. 6d.) no doubt probably suggested the idea to me. Either here, or in any part of the world, if you can only have fodder plants which will draw moisture from a great depth you may laugh at a drought, as I have done here this year through the worst we have ever had.

In volume II of his "Experiences of a Planter, 1871," Mr. Elliot drew attention to the importance of this question, giving reasons in detail; and he now refers also to Dr. Voelcker's "Improvement of Indian Agriculture" for

> an interesting proof of the way in which woods at once arrest excessive, and of course injurious, torrents of rain and increase the number of days over which the rainfall is distributed, thus aiding the farmer in two important ways.

—Yours, etc., W. WEDDERBURN.

Meredith, Gloucester,
24th October, 1901.

The list (referred to above) of plants growing on the Nilgiris, on which cattle browse, is as follows. The botanical name is given first in each case, and the Badagah name follows in brackets:—Celtis tetandra (Hùthuwa), Glochidion Neilgherrense (Hànakay), Breynia patens (—), Osyris arborea (Munnalee), Polygonum chinense (Ghonghu), Elocagnus latifolia (Kòlunga), Lasiosiphon eriocephalus (Nàdah), Pogostemon speciosus (Kulkothùngu), Pogostemon rotundatus (Kurupùdday), Coleus nilghiricus (Kothùnga), Cynoglossum Furcatum (Kothùnga), Strobilanthes (varieties) (Koiacùttah), Wendlandia Notonia (Ginnegùllu), Sonchus sp. (Modjay), Senecio canescens (Koorie gòodoo),

Adenostemma viscosum (Narragiddu), Gaultheria fragrantissima (Mhòlah), Vaccinium Leschenaultu (Unthuwah), Indigofera pulchella (Naduhòobay), Atylosia Candollei (Thògulee), Crotalaria (varieties) (Gìlliegìgge), Sophora glauca (Gilliegìgge), Photinia Lindleyana (Kodeviccay), Photinia Notoniana (Kodeviccay), Hedyotis stylosa (Kodeviccay), Eugenia Arnottiana (Kùmboo nàree), Justicia procumbens (Nèllay hìppay), Desmodium rufescens (Thògalee Kòdee), Symplocos spicata (Bùthugùnnee), Bupleurum ramosissima (Bùthugùnnee), Hypericum Hookerianum (Hòonay), Jasminum humile (Kòthee hìllay), Dodonaea viscosa (Mòrundha).

MR. DUTT ON LAND REVENUE ASSESSMENTS.

To the Editor of "India."

Sir,—I am sure my friend Mr. Dutt will excuse me if I venture to object to some of the statements in his interesting address as too sweeping.

It is true, of course, that the land tax paid by the rayats in Madras is heavier than what is levied from the zemindars (or middlemen) in other parts of India; but it is NOT (speaking generally) heavier than the RENT paid by the tenants of such middlemen, and it is with such rent that the land tax in Madras ought always to be compared. It is misleading to say so broadly that "the assessment is" (universally) "too heavy," and though it may be true in many cases that it sweeps "away the whole economic rent of the land," it is equally certain that the great bulk of the vast and most highly assessed irrigated land is sublet at double and treble the assessment.

Then again, as to irrigation: it is true that far more might have been spent in that way, and, perhaps, much less on railways with advantage to the country, but it is scarcely fair to intimate that irrigation has been (altogether) "neglected"; because a great deal has been and is still being done even under the present system.—Yours, etc., J. B. Pennington.

October 24.

MEMORIAL TO SIR W. W. HUNTER.

SPEECH OF THE MARQUIS OF DUFFERIN.

Oxford, Saturday.

This morning a beautiful east window which has been placed in Cumnor Church, near Oxford, in memory of Sir William Wilson Hunter, K.C.S.I., was unveiled in the presence of a large congregation. There was a short memorial service, conducted by the Vicar (the Rev. S. Y. N. Griffith) and the Rev. Sir John C. Hawkins. An address was delivered by the latter, who said that Sir William Hunter was a man occupied through life and to the very last days of his life with works of monumental greatness, works statistical and historical, which combined to a singular extent largeness of conception and scope with minuteness and accuracy of detail; but in spite of this he devoted himself in a wonderful manner to further the interests of the residents of the locality in which he resided. The window, which represents Christ in glory, was unveiled by Lady Hunter, and Major-General Sir Owen Tudor Burne, on behalf of the committee and subscribers to the memorial fund, made the presentation of the window, requesting the Vicar's acceptance of it. The Vicar accepted the gift in appropriate terms, and dedicatory prayers followed.

Later in the day, a bronze bust of Sir William Hunter, by Mr. Hamo Thornycroft, R.A., was unveiled at the Indian Institute by the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava. The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford (the Provost of Oriel) presided, and amongst those present were Sir Alfred Lyall, Sir Charles Elliott, Sir William Wedderburn, Sir George Birdwood, Lady Hunter, Mr. Campbell Hunter, Miss Marian Hunter, Major-General Sir Owen Burne, Sir Charles Roe, Professor Macdonell (Keeper of the Indian Institute), Sir W. Herschell, the Warden of Merton, the Provost of Queen's, the Warden of Keble, the Rector of Exeter, the Master of Balliol, Principal Fairbairn, Mr. H. Skrine, etc.

The Marquis of Dufferin, who was heartily received, said in view of the touching obituary written by Mr. Skrine of their late friend, which was about to be issued, he felt it was hardly necessary for him to detain them with any observations of his own. But at the same time he could not help asking permission to express the great satisfaction which he experienced in being allowed to take part in that day's ceremonial. Sir William Hunter was a personal friend of his own. He had the privilege of serving with him in India as a colleague, and on many occasions it was his duty to have recourse to Sir William's knowledge, and his experience, and his ability in relation to questions of the very greatest importance. And on all those occasions Sir William never failed to exhibit the greatest zeal and the most anxious industry in order to come to the assistance of the Government of India. (Applause.) Sir William Hunter's general career was known to the world at large; at every stage of it he received marks of the approbation both of the Indian authorities at home and of the Government of India. (Applause.) But perhaps Sir William's most enduring monument would be those works which exhibited his gigantic industry, his illimitable knowledge of the most abstruse circumstances connected with India, and, above all things, his happy felicity in making the public acquainted with the information which, through so many years, he had so laboriously gathered. (Applause.) It was his duty on behalf of the subscribers, whom he felt it to be the greatest honour to represent on that occasion, to present to the Indian Institute the bust of their late friend. (The bust was then unveiled amid applause.) He was sure that in viewing the bust they would all agree with him in saying that it was a most marvellous achievement of the skill of the artist, Mr. Thornycroft. (Applause.) Nothing less could be expected of a man of Mr. Thornycroft's great reputation; not only did the bust exhibit a most striking likeness of Sir William, but Mr. Thornycroft had succeeded in infusing into the countenance that intelligence comingled with that geniality which was Sir William Hunter's characteristic. (Applause.) Of Sir William it might also be said that he certainly died in harness, for in spite of the remonstrances of his medical adviser and of his friends, and of those who loved him, he persisted under the most discouraging conditions of life in his labours, and it was in the midst of those labours that he was snatched away from among them. He was sure they all of them sympathised most deeply with the lady whose grief must, of course, be greater than any, even his greatest friends, must feel. But at all events it would be a consolation to her to know how deeply Sir William Hunter's qualities, both intellectual and individual, had been appreciated by so large a circle of friends, and he was sure that he would be fulfilling her wishes if in conclusion he took that opportunity in her name of thanking them for the sympathy extended towards her. (Applause.)

The Vice-Chancellor said it was his pleasing duty to express to the subscribers to the bust the thanks of the Curators of the Indian Institute, and he would add with great confidence of the whole University, for their gift. He thought they could not overestimate the value of any picture in college hall, or common room, or Bodleian Library, as it enriched the University and was a memento of good work done and services to learning and to the country. (Applause.) Sir William Hunter did exactly the sort of work that in these days they most wanted—the pursuit of knowledge which was to be applied in the great works of administration and government. What they wanted now above all was government founded upon knowledge. He thought that was a difficulty in this country. There were other countries where they had an enlightened bureaucracy, and educated people who believed in knowledge, and who were disposed to trust their affairs to those who had been trained and who knew. He thought there was some complaint in this country that people did not sufficiently believe in knowledge. (Laughter.)

THE FAMINE IN INDIA.

GRAVE ANTICIPATIONS.

The Secretary of State for India has received the following telegram from the Viceroy, dated October 26:—

Scattered showers have been of benefit in Rajputana, Central India, and the Bombay Presidency, and outlook in the Deccan has somewhat improved. There is no change in prospects generally. The outturn of autumn crops will be very short in the Punjab, Rajputana, in part of Central India, and Gujerat. There will also be deficiency in the outturn of rice crops of Behar, the Benares division, and some tracts of limited area in the Central Provinces. Number on relief works decreasing rapidly. Numbers in receipt of relief:—Bombay, 162,000; Bombay Native States, 19,000; Baroda, 27,000; Haidarabad, 1,000; Mysore, 3,000—total, 212,000.

THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW" FUND.

We take the following from the current issue (October 26) of the "Investors' Review":—

Through the kindness of Sir William Wedderburn we have received another small contribution, noted below, to this fund from a lady resident in Weimar. We wish there were many more such, for the necessities of India, as will be seen by what appears on another page of this number, promise to be again urgent to an appalling degree before many months are over. But to beg we have grown ashamed.

	£	s.	d.
To amount previously acknowledged	£980	1	8
,, Mrs. Vaughan, Weimar, Germany, per Sir Wm. Wedderburn		2	12 6
Total to date	£982	14	2

The "Investors' Review" (October 26) says the famine telegram dated October 21 "shows a rapid diminution in the number of people in receipt of gratuitous relief, as was to be expected at this particular season, but in other respects is almost as gloomy as those that have preceded it. In other words, Lord Curzon tells us that famine will again devastate large areas of the Peninsula throughout the coming winter and spring, and it will come upon India helpless, without resources. How is the India Office here contriving to finance the Simla Government? Where is the £3,000,000 loan that failed? Will it have to be doubled when next the home market is appealed to for help?"

The "Morning Leader" writes (October 29):—The latest telegram from the Viceroy concerning the famine in India is a mixture of good and bad news, but the bad news predominates. There have been scattered showers in Rajputana, Central India, and Bombay, and the prospect is somewhat better in the Deccan. That is so far good. But the general prospect is unchanged, and it is certain that the outturn of autumn crops will be very short in the Punjab, Rajputana, part of Central India, and Gujerat.

The last-named area used to be known as the "garden of India," but during the present famine the mortality in Gujerat, as Sir Antony MacDonnell and his colleagues found, has been fearfully and unnecessarily severe. Moreover, there is no longer any doubt that the rice crops will be deficient in Behar, the Benares division, and certain tracts in the Central Provinces. This is alarming news for the last week of October. The Famine Commission was credited with the forecast that the famine (which is now well into its third continuous year) would come to an end this month. Not only is this not the case but there is now only too good reason to believe that the famine will last for many months more. Can it be that it is to become—or has it already become—chronic in India? What is the Lord Mayor doing? When does he propose to re-open the Mansion House Fund? And how far is Lord George Hamilton on the way towards instituting enquiry into the causes, and the prevention, of famine?

INDIAN AGRICULTURE.

LECTURE BY MR. ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

[Special Report.]

On Sunday last, October 27, Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt, C.I.E., formerly of the Indian Civil Service, delivered a lecture at Mansfield House, Canning Town, London, upon "Indian Agriculture." There was an excellent audience, and the meeting proved most successful.

Mr. Dutt said:—The subject of my lecture this evening is Indian Agriculture. The subject is one of great importance, because, as you are all aware, India is a vast continent, equal in extent and population to the whole continent of Europe, if you leave out Russia. And the people of this great continent of India is mainly agricultural. You in England were also mainly an agricultural people over a hundred years ago, and by far the greater part of Englishmen lived with their families in farms. But your splendid supply of coal and iron gave you a start in industries after the invention of steam, and long before the middle of the nineteenth century you had distanced all other countries of the earth in the extent and the excellence of your manufactures. The result was that you gradually neglected your agriculture and swarmed to towns and factories, till at the present time more than half the population of England live in towns and depend on trades and industries, and you buy your corn and vegetables, and even meat, mostly from other nations. I do not myself know if this state of things is good for a nation, or if it can be permanent. Already your supremacy in trades and manufactures is threatened by the rivalry of Germany and America, and what those nations will ultimately achieve no man can foresee.

We in India have gone to the opposite extreme. If you have depended too much on your manufactures, we have depended too much on our agriculture, and four-fifths of the great population of India depend directly or indirectly on the produce of the soil. Our national industries, specially spinning and weaving, have declined within the last hundred years, firstly through the illiberal policy of the East India Company, and secondly by competition with the steam and machinery of Europe. Agriculture is our one national industry now; if agriculture prospers, the people are well off; if crops fail, there is famine in the land.

I myself believe that a civilised nation prospers best if it is mindful both of its agriculture and its industries. And I also believe that both England and India will need some re-adjustment of their industries in the near future. You in this country will have to be more mindful of your agriculture with the growing competition of other nations in various industries. And we in India will have to develop our manufactures by the help of steam and machinery, so as not to be entirely dependent on our crops. The soil is the gift of Heaven to each nation as well as skill in manufactures; and it is a healthy state of things when a large proportion of a nation are engaged in cultivating the soil, while a fairly large proportion of them are also engaged in industries.

In speaking now of our agricultural system in India, I must premise by informing you that our land system is entirely different from yours in England. You are familiar with the landlord who owns his estate, the farmer who takes lease of his farm, and the labourer who tills the soil and is paid by wages. Our system is just the opposite of this. It is the tiller in India who virtually owns his holding of five or ten acres, who inherits it from his father, sells or mortgages it at will, and hands it down to his sons when he dies. Sometimes the tiller pays a rent to a superior landlord; in other instances there is no superior landlord, and the tiller pays the land tax direct to the State. But in both cases the humble tiller is the virtual proprietor of his small holding; and as long as he pays his tax or his rent, he cannot be evicted from his heritable and transferable property. I cannot but think that this ancient land system of India is better than your modern English system; for the soil in India belongs to the nation, and not to a few individuals.

Skill and Industry of Indian Cultivators.

It is generally believed in this country that the Indian tiller, whom we call a rayat, is a thoughtless primitive creature, ignorant of his own interests, antiquated in his methods of agriculture, and altogether a poor relic of the prehistoric past whom it is necessary to instruct and to modernise. Impressed with this idea the Government of India have often been fired by the benevolent desire to teach the Indian cultivator better methods of cultivation; but before they proceeded very far, the Government discovered that they had more to learn than to teach. They found out that under the local conditions of India, it was scarcely possible to improve on the methods which the Indian agriculturist had adopted from the experience of thousands of years; and that while it was possible to improve the supply of water and the supply of manure, it was scarcely possible to improve on the art of growing wheat and rice which the Indian cultivator practised. This is generally the opinion expressed by English scientists who have carefully examined the systems of Indian agriculture. As early as 1832, Dr. Wallick, who was Superintendent of the East India Company's Botanical Gardens at Calcutta, gave his evidence before a Committee of the House of Commons to this effect: "The Bengal husbandry, although in many respects extremely simple, and primeval in its mode and form, yet is not so low as people generally suppose it to be; and I have often found that very sudden innovations in them have never led to any good results. I have known for instance European iron ploughs introduced into Bengal with a view to superseding the extremely tedious and superficial turning of the ground by the common Bengal plough. But what has been the result? That the soil which is extremely superficial . . . . has generally received the admixture of the under soil, which has deteriorated it very much." And with reference to rice cultivation in Bengal, Dr. Wallick remarked: "If we were to live another thousand years, we should hardly see any improvement in that branch of cultivation."

This was said nearly seventy years ago; and let us turn to a more recent opinion—the latest scientific opinion that is available to us. Dr. Voelcker, consulting chemist to the Royal Agricultural Society of England, was sent out to India in 1889 to enquire into Indian agriculture, and submitted a report which is the most valuable and authoritative work we have on that subject. And at the very commencement of his report, Dr. Voelcker bears his testimony to the skill of the Indian agriculturist in these words:—"The ideas generally entertained in England, and often given expression to even in India, that Indian agriculture is, as a whole, primitive and backward, and that little has been done to try and remedy it, are altogether erroneous. . . . . Taking everything together, and more specially considering the conditions under which Indian crops are grown, they are wonderfully good. At his best, the Indian rayat or cultivator is quite as good as, and in some respects the superior of, the average British farmer; while at his worst it can only be said that this state is brought about largely by an absence of facilities for improvement which is probably unequalled in any other country, and that the rayat will struggle on patiently and uncomplainingly in the face of difficulties in a way that no one else would. Nor need our British farmers be surprised at what I say, for it must be remembered that the Natives of India were cultivators of wheat centuries before we in England were. It is not likely, therefore, that their practice should be capable of much improvement. What does, however, prevent them from growing larger crops is the limited facilities to which they have access, such as the supply of water and manure. But to take the ordinary acts of husbandry, nowhere would one find better instances of keeping land scrupulously clean from weeds, of ingenuity in device of water-raising appliances, of knowledge of soils and their capabilities, as well as the exact time to sow and to reap, as one would in Indian agriculture, and this not at its best alone, but at its ordinary level. It is wonderful, too, how much is known of rotation, the system of mixed crops, and of fallowing. Certain it is that I, at least, have never seen a more perfect picture of careful cultivation, combined with hard labour, than I have seen at many of the halting places in my tour" [in India].

A few words about the system of mixed crops and of rotation, as practised in India, will illustrate the skill and knowledge which Indian agriculturists have acquired by long practice. A grain crop like Juar is often put on the ground with a leguminous crop like Arhar. The grain crop grows rapidly and keeps the other back, and when it is reaped the leguminous crop extends itself, grows apace, and in due time is reaped. This system is followed year after year, and while to the casual observer it seems like a continuous cropping, there is really a perfect system of rotation all the time. Sometimes three or even four kinds of

seed are sown at the same time, for instance, wheat, barley, grain, and rape seed. Wheat and grain often occur together, so also wheat and linseed. Sometimes again the mixed cropping is more complicated than even this. For instance there are deep-rooted plants, and there are surface feeders which grow together, drawing their nourishment from different layers of the same soil; there are plants which require shelter, and will not thrive without the friendly neighbourhood of other plants. All this is clearly understood by the Indian cultivator—the heir to the knowledge and experience of thousands of years of tilling—who to the casual British observer appears so ignorant, so improvident, so like a relic of the prehistoric past.

The one crop with which rotation is seldom practised is rice. The reason is that rice grows best on soil the fertility of which is annually renewed by the silt of inundating rivers. The Ganges and the other great rivers of India not only bring their annual supply of water to thirsty crops, but also bring a vast amount of fertilizing silt which they gently deposit on the soil—the finest and richest manure provided by Nature, over millions of acres, without the toil of man. To utilize this manure, the Indian cultivator practises surface ploughing only; any deep ploughing, such as is practised in England, and which has been sometimes stupidly tried in India, only destroys this manure, and turns up the sand below. Over this inundated and annually renewed soil, rice grows year after year without the need of mixed cropping or rotation. Yet I have seen some mixed cropping on such lands also; the rice ripens early, and is reaped early; and the oil seed or pulse sown with it then flourishes in the winter months, and is reaped in February and March.

These few remarks will illustrate the skill and knowledge of the Indian cultivator, and the suitability of his methods and implements to the local conditions of India. Deep ploughing would be injurious to Indian cultivation; and steam ploughs are out of the question where the average field is from half an acre to three or four acres. And I, for one, do not wish to see these small holdings enlarged. The land in India belongs to the nation: each petty cultivator is provided for with his three or four or ten acres; and I would not like to see these humble cultivators squeezed out by capitalists, and small fields turned into extensive areas of cultivation.

I may only add here that where improvements are possible, consistently with the Indian land system and cultivation, they are eagerly adopted by the so-called thoughtless and primitive Indian cultivator. I have myself seen the Indian sugar-grower discarding his awkward sugar mills and adopting a mill invented by Europeans in India, which pressed the cane better, and produced more sugar. Teach him to make cheaper manure or to make better appliances for the supply of water; teach him to make a better selection of seeds, or a cheaper method of threshing; and he will adopt your improvements quickly enough. But propose to him reforms inconsistent with the conditions of Indian agriculture and Indian peasant life, and he will decline your advice with thanks.

Geological Types of Soil.

Having spoken so far of the Indian cultivator, I wish to say one word more of his skill in distinguishing the different kinds of soil suitable for different crops. There are an infinite variety of soils in India, but nevertheless the geological types of soil may be classified into three broad classes. The Alluvial Soil predominates over the whole of northern India, along the basin of the Indus and the Ganges, and consists of mud and sand. Away in the west, virtually throughout the province of Bombay, a basaltic formation called the Black Cotton Soil predominates, and is peculiarly fitted for the growth of cotton, for which Western India has always been famous. And all along the East and South, from the hills of Chota Nagpur and Orissa, right through the dominions of the Nizam of Hyderabad, to the undulating plains of Madras, Mysore, and Travancore, the Red Soil predominates, consisting of archæan and metamorphic rocks. These are the three grand geological divisions of the Indian soil; but as I have said before, there are endless varieties within these three classes; and nothing can exceed the skill with which the Indian cultivator distinguishes the different varieties of soil suitable for different varieties of crops. Chemistry and modern science have yet added nothing to the skill, acquired through the local experience of centuries.

The Want of Manure.

The great need for improvement in Indian agriculture is not new implements and new methods of cultivation, but a sufficient supply of manure and a sufficient supply of irrigation water. There is great apprehension in the minds of thoughtful and scientific observers that the soil of India is being exhausted, not through ignorance of rotation, or proper methods of cultivation, but though the failure of manure. Cattle manure has always been, and is to this day, the universal fertiliser of Indian lands, and the only cheap and available manure. But with the destruction of forests and the scarcity of firewood in these days, cattle manure is now largely dried and made into cakes for use as fuel, and thus the supply of manure for land is growing less and less. You can go to no part of India without seeing thousands of women drying these manure cakes, and taking them on their heads to towns for sale as fuel; and all that is thus consumed in towns as fuel is a loss to the country and to production. Dr. Voelcker has recorded: "As the result of my enquiries I feel I may safely assert that where the practice of burning dung as fuel prevails among the genuine cultivators, it arises, in eight cases out of ten, from the scarcity of firewood." This is a serious and a growing evil; and the only possible remedy for it is in the hands of the Indian Government. Forests must be preserved, not merely for the sake of the valuable timber which is now the principal care of forest officers, but also for the supply of sufficient and cheap firewood for all the cultivators in the country. The rules of the forest department must be brought more in touch with the needs of the agricultural population; and the people must be allowed to obtain—as they always did obtain in past centuries—an ample supply of firewood from jungles, so that their cattle manure might be saved for its proper purpose.

Another cause of the failure of manure in India is the vast exportation of oil seeds from the country to Europe. Under the present system of administration, India has to remit to England a large sum, estimated between twenty and thirty millions annually, without any direct equivalent. This not only impoverishes the people of India directly, but it impoverishes the soil of the country, which is now virtually the sole means of the subsistence of the people. For a large portion of the remittance has to be made up by the exportation of oil seeds. If the oil was manufactured in India, and then exported, the evil would be less; for the oil itself has no manurial properties. But to export entire seed, or the refuse after the removal of the oil is, in the words of Dr. Voelcker, "to export the soil's fertility."

The Want of Water.

Another great need for Indian agriculture is the want of a sufficient supply of water. Except in tracts of lands which are annually inundated by rivers, crops in India depend on the annual rainfall or on irrigation works. The rainfall is always uncertain, and so in old times Hindu Rájás and Mahomedan Emperors constructed vast irrigation works, the remains of which you will find not only in the basins of the Jumna and the Indus, but also in Southern India. Many of these works have been preserved and added to by the British Government; but sufficient attention has not been paid within the last hundred years to constructing new irrigation works. Too much attention has been paid to railways for facilitating the export and import trade of England with India; too little attention has been paid to irrigation for facilitating the agriculture of the people of India. 225 millions sterling have been spent on railways; and only 25 millions have been spent on irrigation works. And thus it happens that out of over 200 million acres of cultivated land in India, scarcely much over 20 millions are protected by irrigation works. I am glad to find, however, that recent famines have at last disturbed the conscience of the Indian Government; and that a Commission, headed by an eminently qualified man, has just been appointed to enquire into this much neglected subject.

The irrigation works required in the different Provinces of India are of different kinds. In the alluvial basins of the Ganges and the Indus, the most suitable irrigation works are CANALS fed from these rivers, and distributing their water through tributaries to the surrounding country. In many parts of Northern India not irrigated by the rivers, the most suitable works are WELLS, and some help and encouragement to their construction have lately been given to the people by that ablest of the present Indian administrators, Sir Antony MacDonnell. In Bengal, where the rainfall is copious, and the fields are often inundated by rivers, SHALLOW PONDS excavated in the fields are the most suitable irrigation works; and I have seen such ponds, excavated by the old Rájás of the country, two or three miles in circumference, the like of which has never been done in recent times. Away in Madras and Southern India where the soil is undulating, and the underlying rock helps the retention of water, the most suitable irrigation works are RESERVOIRS made by constructing large embankments, and thus impounding all the water descending from the hill slopes. Some of the most magnificent works of this kind, constructed by the old Polygars of Madras, were seen by Dr. Francis Buchanan in his journey through Southern India a hundred years ago. If such works had been multiplied within these hundred years, famines would have been less frequent and less disastrous than they are to-day.

Afforestation.

Gentlemen, it may sound somewhat strange, but it is nevertheless a fact, that the needed humidity of the soil is closely connected with the preservation of trees and forests. The question whether large forests and plantations cause and increase the rainfall has often been discussed, and I will not enter into that debateable matter. But there can be no doubt that forests and large plantations, by lowering the temperature, cause the rain to descend in gentle showers, where the clouds would otherwise pass on, or burst in wasteful torrents. Thus, if trees do not cause rainfall, they certainly distribute the rain; if they do not increase the quantity of rain, they certainly increase the number of rainy days. It has been noticed that in one station in Southern India, that of Utakamand, the total number of rainy days in five years, from 1870 to 1874—excluding the monsoon months—was 374. This was when the station was bare of woods. Since then, trees have been planted and the place is well wooded now, and the total number of rainy days in the five years from 1886 to 1890, —excluding the monsoon months—was no less than 416. This increase in the number of rainy days is a great advantage to agriculture, even if there be no difference in the actual quantity of annual rainfall.

Want of Pasture Land.

You will see, therefore, that forests are required, not only for supplying fuel to the agricultural population, but also for dis-

tributing and utilising the rains. Another great use of forests and jungles is to supply grazing lands for cattle. In olden times, most villages in India had their adjoining jungle or waste lands for the grazing of cattle, and such lands, pertaining to each village, were used by the villagers in common. The great increase in the area of cultivation in recent times has led to the enclosing of these commons, as you would describe the process in England, until the want of sufficient pasture lands has become a real and grave difficulty. When the crops have been reaped, the cattle are let loose on the fields; but in other months they are fed on straw and fodder procured with difficulty. This growing evil has come to the notice of the Government. Up to 1880, wrote Mr. Nicholson, of Coimbatore, every tenant used to hold one-fifth of his farm as pasture at one quarter the usual assessment; but this salutary rule was abolished at the new Settlement of 1880. In 1883 the Government of India recorded a resolution that the cultivated area in India had steadily increased at the expense of the grazing area. And in 1890 Sir D. Brandis recorded that in Madras the working plans for the fuel and fodder reserves should contain proposals for throwing open certain forest areas to grazing. Adequate measures, however, have not yet been taken, and the subject is one which requires the closest attention, both of the Government and of private landlords.

An Uncertain Land-Tax.

The last evil from which agriculture suffers in India is an uncertain land-tax. You are aware that in England the Government levied a high tax of four shillings in the pound, or 20 per cent. of the rental, during the wars of the early years of the eighteenth century; and this was reduced to two shillings, and then to one shilling in the pound, or 5 per cent. of the rental, after the Peace of Utrecht. The land tax in England varied between these limits for about a hundred years, till it was made permanent and redeemable by the great minister, William Pitt, in 1798. In India the land tax was made permanent only in Bengal and a few other places. In Northern India, after many blundering and oppressive experiments, the land tax was fixed in 1855, not at 5 per cent. of the rental, but at 50 per cent. of the rental; and in Southern India, too, the same general rule of levying the land tax at 50 per cent of the rent was recognised in 1864. You will consider this rate both excessive and oppressive; but the worst of it is that even this heavy rate is not strictly adhered to. In Northern India, the Government now seek to levy 50 per cent., not on the current rental, but on the prospective rental of estates; and a great many minor taxes are assessed on the land in addition to the land tax. In the Central Provinces of India the rule of levying 50 per cent of the rental as tax was evaded in 1863 and openly abandoned in 1888; what is levied now is a great deal more. And in Southern India, i.e., in Bombay and Madras, the tax which is levied from the cultivators often approximates to 100 per cent. of the economic rent. Fresh Settlements are being continually made in different parts of India; neither the landlord nor the cultivator knows what the State demand will be after each new settlement; and this uncertainty deadens agricultural energy, and prevents agricultural improvements. What is wanted for the improvement of agriculture in India is a clear intelligible limit to the land tax—a limit which will not be evaded or altered by the whims and fancies of Settlement officers and Provincial rulers. 50 per cent. of the rental or the economic rent is the rule theoretically recognised in all parts of India where the land tax has not been permanently fixed; and it is a heavy tax for an agricultural nation to pay. But something would be gained even if this heavy rate was religiously adhered to, and was not evaded and exceeded, as it now constantly is at each recurring Settlement in many parts of India. Nothing can be more fatal to agricultural prosperity, nothing is more destructive to agricultural improvements, than any uncertainty in the State demand from the soil.

Gentlemen, I thank you for the patient hearing which you have given me on a subject which is not altogether familiar to you. But it is a subject of the greatest importance to the prosperity and well-being of India, and to three hundred millions of your fellow-subjects. The Indian Government commands ability, knowledge, and experience, but is not in touch with the lives of the vast Indian population. There are no Indian members either in the Secretary of State's Council in London, or in the Viceroy's Executive Council in India; and questions, involving military operations or the revenue, naturally receive more attention than questions involving the well-being and the prosperity of the unrepresented nation. It is a truism that there can be no government for the good of a people without some sort of representation; and the Indian Government will fail to secure the happiness of the Indian people until there is some representation of the popular opinion in the Executive Councils of the Empire. The economic condition of the people of India will never be improved until the people themselves are permitted a reasonable share in the administration of their own concerns.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON ON THE DRAIN FROM INDIA.

Commenting on Lord G. Hamilton's letter on this subject (printed in our last issue) the "Investors' Review" (October 26) writes:—"Having read this note we cease to marvel at Lord George Hamilton's optimism. He appears to be as incapable of comprehending what the true position of India is as the man who wrote to him. Would he kindly explain how it is that the large annual expenditure on railways and other public works tends 'naturally' to the development of the country and to the amelioration of the condition of the Native population? Whose money is it that produces these developments, the Indian's or ours? We could put a meaning upon this assertion were it the former. Did the wealthy classes of India come forward and build these railways with their means, obtaining for their advances such interest or dividend as the investment fairly yielded, then the benefit of the improvements would accrue to the people of the country. Notoriously, however, this is not what takes place. We doubt if 5 per cent. of the capital of the railways of India is held by Natives of that country. It has all been provided by the British public, and the earnings of that capital come here in the shape of guaranteed or other dividends. From this it follows as clearly as the logic of a proposition in Euclid that what benefits the capitalist may be injurious to the people subjected to this form of 'improvement.' Every year between 50 and 60 per cent. of the gross charges made by these British-Indian railways for their services is exported to the gain of the British investor. We are not quarrelling with the investor for taking his gains. It is right and proper that he should do so. What we object to is the foolish optimism which refuses to see that progress and developments of this kind may be too expensive for a population poor to begin with.

"Moreover, Lord George Hamilton is apparently oblivious altogether of the enormous cost in other directions of the British over-burden upon poverty-stricken India. Heavy as they are, the burdens imposed by railway capital upon the people of India are only a minor, or at least a lighter, portion of the enormous expenditure imposed upon the country by the British Government, and we believe it possible that an administration bent upon serving India in the interest of the Indian people, upon economising in the direction of excessive home charges—for pensions, for the army, for postal services, for the hundred-and-ten various enterprises that have been allowed to grow up—and capable of cutting down the army expenditure to, say, the figure that ruled before the Mutiny, would be able make India prosperous and contented without interfering to the extent of sixpence with the legitimate earnings of the railways we have laid down in the country. Long familiarity with Indian finance has convinced us of this, and to go girding at the capital outlay as a cause of India distress, extravagant and injudicious though much of that outlay has been, is to lead the minds of the people away from the true source of India's trouble—the direct, perennial, constantly augmenting lavishness of the Simla Government. It is a debateable point whether, as worked, the railways may not be often injurious to the people, because of the facilities they give for the export of produce that might be better retained at home; and certainly these railways have done nothing whatever to lessen the liability of the rural population to suffer from famine, although they may have put it in the power of the Government to bring relief more swiftly to the hungry. But admitting everything that can be said upon the hasty, ill-considered, and wasteful manner in which India has been exploited through the zeal of the progress-by-railways fiend, we are satisfied that the Government expenditure of India could be reduced by a matter of Rs.150,000,000 to Rs.200,000,000 per annum, and the saving thus effected devoted to the building up of a substantial, contented, well-to-do, and intelligent cultivating peasantry, whose attachment to the British dominion would be the best possible bulwark of our Empire. Unfortunately, modern English ideas do not look upon conceptions of Government such as this as in proper accord with our Imperial dignity. To spend the substance of the people upon the people, in their interests not in ours, is a species of philanthropic insanity, and the killing trade alone is great—the true source of wealth."

The "Morning Leader" of Monday last published the following letter:—

To the Editor of the "Morning Leader."

Sir,—"Is it not a fact, my lord," asks Lord George Hamilton's correspondent, "that the Government of which you are the head do not drain India?" "Yes, it is," replies his lordship. Will the Secretary of State for India concede that, inasmuch as the State does not call even upon the Crown Colonies to pay for its Colonial Secretary and his office, the payment of more than £140 a year, that the State compels India to make for the support of its Indian Secretary and his office, constitutes a "drain" on that poor country?

You point out in your leaderette some of the principal wounds through which India, to use Lord Salisbury's admission, is being "bled." The noble Marquis admitted further that "much of the revenue (of India) is exported without a direct equivalent." The "lancet," however, is not directed, as his lordship would have us believe, "to those parts where the blood is congested, or at least sufficient" (if such parts there be in the famished frame of India), but "to those which are already feeble for want of it"—to the masses of Indian poor who pay the land-tax and the tax on the salt they eat.

Lord George tells his enquirer that "famine is attributable to climatic conditions." Has the climate of India changed since 1770? If not, why then, in spite of the continual "amelioration of the condition of the Native population" from the days of Lord Dalhousie through the agency of public works and railways, are famines incomparably more frequent and extensive since that year than in any former century? Why is it that, during the years of profound internal tranquillity, blessedly effected by the British rule, the Indian national debt rapidly rises, Indian taxes and food prices unremittingly increase, Indian income per head remains almost stationary, while in England the National Debt gets reduced, the taxes and prices of food fall low, and the individual income vastly augments? What is the reason? It is the "drain"—copious and unceasing "drain."—Yours, etc.,

An Indian.

PUBLICATIONS RELATING TO INDIA.

To be obtained from
THE BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, 84-85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Reports of the Proceedings at the Annual Sessions of the Indian National Congress, from the 3rd to the 14th Session. 2s. each, post free.

The Skeleton at the (Jubilee) Feast (Congress Green Book I.), by Sir WILLIAM WEDDERBURN, Bart. (being a series of suggestions for the prevention of famine in India). Post free, 7d.

Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure: Evidence-in-Chief of the Indian Witnesses. (Congress Green Book II.) Post free, 1s. 10d.

The Proposed Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions in India. Memorial to the Secretary of State. With two Appendices. (Congress Green Book III.) Post free, 1s. 2d.

Two Statements presented to the Indian Currency Committee (1898), by Mr. DADABHAI NAOROJI.

Speech by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., in the House of Commons, August 14, 1894, on the Debate on the Indian Budget.
Ditto do. in the House of Commons, February 12, 1895, on the Debate on the Address.
Ditto do. on British Rule in India (1898).

Presidential Address by Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, M.P., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Lahore, 1893.

Presidential Address by Mr. A. M. Bose, M.A., delivered to the Indian National Congress at Madras, 1898.

Speeches of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., President of the Indian National Congress, 1894-5.

Valedictory Address of Mr. Alfred Webb, M.P., delivered at Bombay, January 17, 1895.

Speeches of Mr. D. E. Wacha delivered at the 9th, 11th and 14th Sessions of the Indian National Congress.

Is the Government of India Responsible to Anyone, and if so to Whom? Speech delivered at Croydon by Mr. W. C. BONNERJEE.

The Famine in India. Speeches delivered at a Public Reception to Mr. Vaughan Nash on his return from the Famine Districts, July, 1900.

Mr. A. O. Hume's Farewell to India. Speech delivered at Bombay, 1894.

India Reform Pamphlet IX. The State and Government of India under its Native Rulers. 3d.

The Indian National Congress: its Aims and Justification. By ROBERT KNIGHT.

Indian Famines: Their Causes and Remedies. By PRITHWIS CH. ROY. Post Free, 1s. 1d.

A Needed Reform in the Indian Administration, by ROMESH C. DUTT, C.I.E.

The Bogey of a Russian Invasion. A Lesson from the Tirah Campaign, by Col. H. B. HANNA.

The High Courts and the Collector-Magistrates in India, by J. DACOSTA.

The Government of India and its Reform through Parliamentary Institutions, by J. DACOSTA.

Note on Sir J. Westland's Budget, 1894-5.

Note on the Explanatory Memorandum of the Secretary of State for India, 1894-5.

Note on Sir James Westland's Budget, 1895-6.

Note on Sir H. Waterfield's Tables, 1884-5 to 1894-5.

The Poor Man's Lamb: Famine Insurance for the Masses *versus* Exchange Compensation for the Classes.

REPRINTS FROM "INDIA."

The Judiciary and the Executive in India. Interview with Mr. Manomohan Ghose.
The Bombay Government and Higher Education, by the Hon. C. H. Setalved.
A National Famine Grant, Letter from the London Indian Society to Lord Salisbury, 1900.
India and the General Election (1900).
"Melancholy Meanness."
The "Over-population" Fallacy Again.
No National Contribution?
The "Slimness" of the India Office.
"Mainly a Question of Money."

A Selection of the Publications enumerated above will be forwarded to responsible persons or Associations in the United Kingdom for gratuitous distribution, on written application to the British Committee, Indian National Congress, 84-85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

Crown 8vo, cloth, pp. 204, with two Illustrations, price 3s. 6d.

ASOKA: THE BUDDHIST EMPEROR OF INDIA.

BY VINCENT A. SMITH, M.R.A.S., *late of the Indian Civil Service.*
New Supplementary Volume of the "Rulers of India" Series.
LONDON: HENRY FROWDE,
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.

"THE PEOPLE OF INDIA:

Their Many Merits by Many who have Known Them."

Mr. Alfred Webb's articles reprinted in pamphlet form from "INDIA."

A copy will be sent free on receipt of 1d. stamp to cover postage.

Secretaries of Political Associations, Clubs, Literary Societies, in the United Kingdom may obtain copies for distribution on application.

BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Europeans resident in India desiring copies should send ½ anna stamp to
Mr. HARICHANDRA A. TALCHERKAR,
52, Veronica Street, Bandra, Bombay.

"INDIA," JAN.-JUNE, 1901.

VOL. XV.

NOW READY.
Bound in Cloth (post free) 7/6 each net cash.

The following volumes of "INDIA," bound in cloth, can also be obtained:—

Vols. V. (1894), VI. (1895), VII. (1896), VIII. (1897). Price 8/6 each, post free.

Vols. IX. (Jan.-June, 1898), X. (July-Dec., 1898), XI. (Jan.-June, 1899), XII. (July-Dec., 1899). XIII. (Jan-June, 1900). XIV. (July-Dec., 1900). Price 7/6 each, post free.

Remittances should accompany order.

Apply to the Manager, "INDIA,"
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

THE GRANHAMS, SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

W. A. DOUGLAS RUDGE, B.A., late Scholar and Prizeman of St. John's College, Cambridge, is prepared to take entire charge of a limited number of young Indian gentlemen and to educate them for the University or Public Schools. Special attention paid to Science subjects. Healthy country home four miles from Cambridge. References kindly permitted by Romesh C. Dutt, Esq., C.I.E., and Dadabhai Naoroji, Esq., in London.

The annual subscription to INDIA (post free) is nine shillings for England and six rupees for India. Subscriptions are payable in advance. Remittances, or communications relating to subscriptions or any other matter of business connected with INDIA, should in all cases be sent to the MANAGER *of INDIA 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W. In any communication regarding copies of INDIA circulated in India, it is requested that Subscribers be referred to both by name and by the number printed in each case upon the addressed wrapper.*

Subscription in England :—
November 1 to End of Year (Post free), 1s. 10d.

Cheques and Post Office Orders payable to W. DOUGLAS HALL.

Copies of INDIA can be obtained from the Offices of the Paper; from MR. ELLIOT STOCK, *Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and to order at any Railway Bookstall.*

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2 Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 and 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.